



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Of course this movement does not appeal to certain rich capitalists who are opposed to the spirit of democracy, as to them the idea of a world federation has the ear-marks of socialism. Being a practical plan, it also does not appeal to manufacturers of armaments, who, by the way, have always upheld the Hague Court in its efforts to humanize war. However, if properly presented, such a plan must appeal to the great middle class, who are the ones that are obliged to do the fighting when war actually comes and who must ultimately pay the taxes.

If any one nation gains a decided victory in the present war, that nation will dictate the terms of peace, and will endeavor to protect her victory by further armaments. Although Germany may be crushed, yet the probabilities are that the German people will quickly revive, as did France after the Franco-Prussian war. In either case, the result would be that the old conflict would continue as in the past. Nations would still be obliged to spend huge sums on armaments and navies, and this would be especially true of this country.

If, however, after the nations have been fighting for a year longer, the armies and navies are in approximately the same position as at present, there is good reason to believe that the nations may voluntarily get together on some plan which will neutralize the seas and prevent any one nation from erecting further artificial barriers against another. If such a plan should be adopted, military expenditures would greatly de-

crease, industry and trade would receive a tremendous impetus, and the period of prosperity to follow the war should extend for a generation. Hence, it will be seen that not only is it of vital importance to American business men that the war be brought to a close as soon as possible, but it is even more imperative that the result shall be a draw. Then nations may see that nothing can be gained by fighting, and they may be forced, from sheer exhaustion, to unite on some better plans.

Most business people realize that such a result must come sometime. There is no logical reason why any one nation should control the world's trade. Although it may be for the interest of this country to have England win rather than Germany, it would be far better for us if the seas were neutralized and the trade of the world under the joint protection of all nations.

Whether this war will be the means of bringing about international control of international commerce I do not know. I believe that it may, if we will recognize that there are real economic causes of war which must be eliminated before there can be world peace; that these causes will be eliminated only as each nation is willing to give up something for the general good, and teach that, if such is for the general good, there must be an ultimately beneficial reaction to ourselves; that only through economic co-operation with other nations can our own interests finally be fully developed and protected.

## WAR, RELIGION, AND PREPAREDNESS

The following interesting articles are in answer to a letter reading as follows:

"THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE, the established organ of the peace movement in America, is seeking to gather the opinions of a few leaders of religious thought upon the question of war, as it affects the United States in the present crisis.

"Would you be willing to write for us, to appear in connection with other similar articles in an early number, a brief statement of your views upon what should be the attitude of the church and religion toward war in general and toward the issue of increasing military preparedness in the United States in particular?

"THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE would especially appreciate the courtesy of your co-operation in this undertaking."

These articles are the first two received. It is expected that others in the series will follow in future numbers.—  
THE EDITOR.

By RABBI STEPHEN S. WISE

Of the Free Synagogue, New York City

**T**HERE ought not to be, and there ought never to have been, any question as to the attitude of religion toward war. It must be pointed out that the church and religion are used as interchangeable terms; but unhappily they have not been interchangeable things. What the attitude of religion toward war is we know. Religion and war cannot coexist. If religion is to be, war must go. When war is, religion goes. There is no room in the world for a religious attitude of the human soul and the fact of war, for war means everything that religion opposes. It means lust, brutality, slaughter, covetousness, pitilessness, and all the other fiendish things whose resurrection from hell religion ought to make impossible.

One need not go back to the inspiration of Isaiah nor yet to the unmistakable meaning of the words of Jesus in order to ascertain what is the attitude of religion

By RABBI SAMUEL SCHULMAN

Of Temple Beth-El, New York City

**I**T WAS perfectly natural that the great world-war should profoundly influence American policy. It has brought home to the imagination of the American people that America can, in no sense, be longer considered as dwelling in isolation. It is bound together with the ends of the earth by a hundred ties. The realization of this has naturally quickened thought, and what was regarded, only a year ago, by men in the highest authoritative position, as a manifestation of hysteria, is now recognized as the most serious problem which the American people has to face—the necessity for adequate military preparation for the defense of American institutions and American power, prestige, and influence in the international world council.

Only experts are entitled to give advice as to just how much preparedness we need. Those whose function it is, in however limited a way, to influence public opinion,

## Rabbi Wise

toward war. The trouble has been that the church has not been religion organized. It has been religion organized into something else. It has been religion organized plus. It has been a religious organization minus religion. It has been a religious organization with the stress on the organization.

No great cause has ever been more fatally misrepresented than has been religion by the church—I mean practically all churches of the western world. I cannot speak for the synagogue, for the synagogue has been so lightly and loosely organized during the past centuries that it is difficult to know what the attitude of the people of Israel would have been if theirs had been an organized and powerful religious communion, though I know perfectly well what that attitude ought to have been. Some religious organizations have stood out as against the church's participation in war—for example, the Friends, or Quakers—but their number has been inconsiderable by the side of the vast numbers of so-called church people who want war and live by war and love war, and are bound, as far as they can, to perpetuate war.

I do not believe it to be true that the present war marks the breakdown of religion. It merely tokens the failure of the church to be true to itself. It means no more than that religion has not been tried. The world has robed itself in the trappings of religion, but its heart has remained unchanged. I believe that there is more religion today amid the bloody and hell-like things of the trenches than is ordinarily to be found amid the stately grandeur of church and cathedral. The churches could not avert war. They did not try to avert war. They could not do this because they are impotent—because their voice is unheeded. They are dragooned into the defense of and apology for the State like every other miserable vassal. The question is whether the churches are doing anything or can do anything in the direction of peace. The question is whether, after once peace has been made, the churches will rouse themselves into a unity and determination to avert a renewal of this unspeakable holocaust.

There is another issue, and that may frankly be discussed, namely, the attitude of the church and religion toward the matter of increasing military "preparedness." I believe that the recent declaration of a considerable group of churchmen in favor of increasing military "preparedness" at this time constitutes one of the sorriest possible indictments of the church.

I know full well that honest differences of opinion are possible on questions of national importance, but this is more than a national question. The question of a program of extraordinary "preparedness" at this time, inevitably leading to militarism, is perhaps the gravest moral issue that has been before the American people since the founding of the Republic. Who does not know that "preparedness" means war? The representatives of the religious life of a nation ought to be the first to proclaim that the old maxim, "*Si vis pacem, para bellum*," is a hell-spawned lie. The teachers of religion ought to know that war will not solve our political problems, and that it is the business of men who believe in a fairer order than the order of force and brutality to insist upon the ordering of our international relationships upon the basis of good will and justice and brotherliness, and not at the point of the bayonet or the mouth of the cannon.

## Rabbi Schulman

must come to clear thought upon the principle involved. To me it is clear that it is the duty of America so to prepare itself as to make its safety, the integrity of its institutions, and the scope of its influence independent of the good will of any other nation. We should not be objects of charity and generosity, but we should be listened to when we plead for justice, because of the authority we can put behind our plea. That authority, as the world is constituted today, is, in the last analysis, force. No nation can conserve what is worth while preserving unless it is able to take care of itself, and its citizens are ready to lay down their lives for what is dearer than life.

I hold that America has a great trust for humanity. It is a nation that, for the first time in the world's history, has organized itself, not on the basis of race, nor on the basis of creed, but on the basis of the recognition of the rights of men and the dignity of our common humanity. It therefore has a destiny as a teacher to the world which is greater and more prophetic than that of any other people on the earth. It can only perform its mission for humanity, if it makes itself strong and independent enough, so as not to be at the mercy of any great military power whose ideas and ambitions would clash.

Preparedness is not only indispensable for the safeguarding of American institutions; it is also a means for education in patriotism. If we are ever to develop a strong national consciousness, then every one in the nation must feel, not only that it is his privilege to enjoy what the country offers, but that it is his duty to serve the country. Nothing so impresses the imagination of the average man with the duty of service as to make him feel, early in life, that he is to give up time for preparation, and eventually to be ready to lay down his life in the service of his country.

I believe that America's message is peace to the world. By its very spirit of a democracy that is a melting-pot of races, it gives the example to the world of the possible federation of mankind. I know that America, even with adequate military preparedness, will not over-night, as it were, change its spirit. It will remain the same free democracy, with social justice as its guiding ideal; but it will become a more efficient democracy, because it will be able "to take its own part." While it is preparing itself, it can very well go on, in the direction of its past policies of encouraging, by treaty, by The Hague Tribunal, by every possible means, the great ideal of the world's peace. There is no contradiction between promoting peace and preparedness.

It has been said that the great armaments in Europe helped to bring about the war. There is something of truth in this statement, to the extent that a nation that has no armament cannot fight. Where armaments exist, the sensitiveness of a nation may be keener and its readiness to insist upon what is coming to it may be more energetic. But, on the other hand, a nation without armament is not exempt from attack, as history proves.

The education of humanity is many-sided. Progress implies many elements. Peace will come to the world only as the effect of righteousness. It cannot be an exclusive motive, for that would mean the disintegration of the moral fibre of men. It can only come as a result, the consequence of the establishment of justice in the minds and hearts of men in their dealings with one another within a nation and in the international relations

## Rabbi Wise

Not since the days of the abolition of slavery has the church been subjected to the test it now faces. Woe unto the church if it lightly takes its place by the side of those powers which are urging that "preparedness," which is bound to lead us into war, and not only into war, but almost sure to make impossible, perhaps for generations, the rightful ordering and solving of our international problems.

We have no enemies to fight. We have no will to fight. We have no reason to fight. It is the business of this Republic, isolated, in a sense, as it is, and girt on every side save the north by the inviolate sea, to lead the world not in the piling up of armaments, not in those hasty preparations for war which mean war, but in an organized and, as I believe, irresistible attempt to bring the nations to an understanding that there is a better, juster, humaner way of meeting international difficulties.

That way is the way of religion. That way is the way of good will, the way of sympathy, the way of service, the way of sacrifice, the way of love.

## Rabbi Schulman

of the various peoples. Until that time comes, force will be an indispensable means to which to have recourse, as the last resort, for the inculcation of righteousness.

The project of a world league to enforce peace seems to me the most promising one at present, although to one who thinks on the surface it may be guilty of the paradox being ready to fight in order to maintain peace. If there is wisdom in such a league to enforce peace, America ought to be equipped to speak in it with authority.

Only those who are consistent advocates of the doctrine of non-resistance to evil, and who believe exclusively in moral persuasion, can fail to recognize the need of an adequate preparation on the part of America for the maintenance of its influence, for the preservation of policies that concern its welfare as a people. While we should do everything in our power, by education and by the creation of new machinery, for the facilitating of arbitration and the minimizing of the possibilities of war, we should at the same time prepare ourselves very adequately, so as to be able to play our role as the great democracy champion of peace and good will to men.

## THE CELEBRATION OF PEACE DAY\*

By FANNIE FERN ANDREWS

Secretary, American School Peace League

WITH two-thirds of the world at war, why should we observe Peace Day? For a dozen years past the schools of this country and of other countries have set aside May 18 for the purpose of concentrating attention on the significance of the work of The Hague Peace Conferences. Now, with the threatened breakdown of civilization in Europe today, the manhood of the nations shattered, homes ruined, productive energy diverted to the one task of killing, does it not appear that the Peace Conference is out of joint with the times? Under the circumstances, would it not be well to suspend the customary reference to this event this year?

Quite the contrary; the system of law for which The Hague Conference stands offers the only hope to war-stricken Europe. This common tribunal is the only light upon the horizon, and it is the duty of us all to keep this light burning. The opening of the First Hague Peace Conference on May 18, 1899, is, without doubt, the starting point and the center of international progress. This conference is described by international

jurists and statesmen as the beginning of a new epoch for international law and international relations. This and the Second Hague Conference, which met on June 15, 1907, have forced the recognition of the principle that the establishment of equitable law is an essential to the realization of peace. Moreover, the achievements of these conferences have impressed the world with the possibility and the desirability of "making the practice of civilized nations conform to their peaceful professions." The hope of civilization lies in the progressive effort which has given to the family of nations the germ of an international law-making body. Law is the only substitute for war.

The present is not a time for hopeless dejection, in spite of the momentous struggle across the water, which seems to demonstrate the overturning of international law. Upon close examination we see signs of very great progress. Almost all the European powers proposed recourse to The Hague Tribunal or to a conference of interested powers to avoid war, and when this was not successful every belligerent government, without exception, published its reasons for going to war, according to The Hague Convention. This appeal to the public opinion of mankind has no historical precedent. Never before have the nations, on such a broad scale, sought to justify their actions at the bar of this tribunal.

Our task is to strengthen public opinion, which is the only practicable sanction for international law. Nothing is more conspicuous in the present war than the sensitiveness of the belligerents to the charges of violations of treaties and the established law of nations. No breach of international law in this war will pass unnoticed. The combined action of modern powers, represented chiefly by The Hague Conferences, has developed this

\*For appropriate material for the observance of the 18th of May, the American School Peace League recommends the "Cantata for Peace Day," by John Charles Donovan, Director of Music in the Cincinnati schools; "The Promotion of Peace," by Fannie Fern Andrews, Bulletin 1913; No. 12, United States Bureau of Education; "In the Vanguard," by Katrina Trask, for secondary and normal schools; "The Enemy," by Beulah Marie Dix, for secondary school boys; "A Pageant of Peace," by Beulah Marie Dix, for the upper grades of the elementary schools, and "Where War Comes," by Beulah Marie Dix, for the lower school grades. "Eighteenth of May; history of its observance as Peace Day," a pamphlet of eight pages, by Lyra D. Trueblood, can be obtained from the American Peace Society. Other literature can be obtained from the American School Peace League, 405 Marlborough St., Boston.